

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,527	03/10/2004	Roger M. Bernsen	5265.3813	2526
22235 7590 03/23/2007 MALIN HALEY AND DIMAGGIO, PA			EXAMINER	
1936 S ANDR	EWS AVENUE	•	LAVINDER, JACK W	
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33316			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•	•	3677	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
3 MC	NTHS	03/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Cumment	10/708,527	BERNSEN, ROGER M.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Jack W. Lavinder	3677		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 De	ecember 2006.			
· —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E				
Disposition of Claims				
 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11.	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. S have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No In this National Stage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rochas, 1712171 in view of Driggott, 1182534.

Rochas discloses a temporary setting for a gemstone to allow the gemstone to be interchanged with other gemstones when the wearer decides to change the stone. The setting includes a cylindrical spring (b, figures 1-3) hinged to the setting for closing on the bottom of a gemstone to resiliently hold the gemstone in permanently in place (page 1, lines 55-84) until the wearer decides to change the stone. The setting also includes an inside bezel including a narrowed conically circular shaped passage (a1, figure 4) with a diameter smaller than the diameter of the gemstone to prevent the passage of the gemstone through the top of the setting.

The claims call for an opening provided in the cylindrical sidewall of the spring.

Rochas fails to disclose this limitation. However, Driggott discloses a slit (figure 3) in the sidewall of the cylindrical spring (10) in order to improve the amount of force the spring places on the setting to hold the gemstone in place. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to place of slit opening in a slightly enlarged cylindrical spring in Rochas's setting in order to improve the retention force of the spring

to prevent the unwanted opening of the spring and the subsequent loss of the gemstone.

With regard to the use of the term "permanent" in the claims, Rochas and Driggott both disclose settings that are "permanent" until the wearer decides to change the gemstone. The limitation "permanent" is considered to be met, because as long as the wearer desires to have a certain stone in the setting, the springs in both Rochas and Driggott will permanently hold the stone in the setting. This is exactly the same with all "permanently" set stones. For instance, a diamond set in a ring is considered permanent until the diamond fails out of the setting or the wearer decides to change the diamond. Therefore, the term permanent is considered to be a relative term of degree (nothing is really permanent) and for this reason Rochas and Driggott as described previously meets this limitation.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claim 2 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. Claims 4 and 5 have been allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack W. Lavinder whose telephone number is 571-272-7119. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday, 9-4:00pm.

Art Unit: 3677

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 571-272-7075. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jack W Lavinder
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3677

Page 4

12/28/2006